



PATENT APPLICATION

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re application of

Docket No. Q52863

Yoshikazu KOBAYASHI

Appln. No. 09/238,502

Group Art Unit: 2644

Confirmation No. 6211

Examiner: TRAN, C.

Filed: January 27, 1999

For: INFORMATION TERMINAL CAPABLE OF ORIGINATING A CALL, METHOD OF  
ORIGINATING A CALL AND RECORDING MEDIUM WHICH STORES THE  
PROGRAM FOR ORIGINATING A CALL

**APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192**

**MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RECEIVED**

JUN 16 2004

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

In accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.192, Appellant submits that the following comprises the Appellant's Brief on Appeal from the Office Action dated November 18, 2003, wherein claims 1-23 were finally rejected. This Appeal Brief is being filed in triplicate and is accompanied by a Submission which includes the required appeal fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c). Appellant's Notice of Appeal was filed on April 12, 2004. Therefore, the present Appeal Brief is timely filed.

**I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is NEC Infrontia Corporation (Assignee) by virtue of an assignment executed by the inventor (Appellant), on December 24, 1998, and recorded by the

06/15/2004 WRBDELRI 00000084 09238502  
01 FC:1402 330.00 0P

AF/2644  
#17  
J.D.  
6/21/04

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192  
U.S. Application No. 09/238,502  
Attorney Docket No. Q52863

Assignment Branch of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on January 27, 1999 (at Reel 009733, Frame 0305), wherein the entire right, title and interest in the application were assigned to NEC Corporation, and a subsequent assignment of these rights from NEC Corporation to NEC Infrontia Corporation, via an assignment executed on October 2, 2001, and recorded by the Assignment Branch of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 10, 2001 (at Reel 012467, Frame 0874).

## **II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellant states that, upon information and belief, Appellant is not aware of any co-pending appeal or interference which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

## **III. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

The present application was filed on January 27, 1999 with claims 1-23. Claims 3-5 and 8-23 were amended in the Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 filed on September 19, 2002 in response to the non-final Office Action dated June 21, 2002. Thereafter, no further amendments have been made to claims 1-23, which are all the claims currently pending in the application. Claims 1-23 (*see* Appendix) are the claims on appeal.

## **IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

No amendments were filed subsequent to a final Office Action.

## **V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION**

Conventionally, an information terminal, in which an operating system (OS) is installed, has either a telephone line interface for permitting telephone communication through a telephone line or a modem that is connected to the telephone line, so that telephone communication can be

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192  
U.S. Application No. 09/238,502  
Attorney Docket No. Q52863

made with the assistance of the OS (Appellant's specification: page 1, lines 17-20). The OS may be a windowing OS, which can display multiple windows on a monitor of the information terminal (Appellant's specification: page 1, lines 20-24). The windows displayed by the OS generally correspond to different programs/applications (Appellant's specification: page 1, lines 14-16).

According to the OS, it is possible to display a telephone panel window or telephone key window for inputting a telephone number by clicking with a pointing device connected to the information terminal (Appellant's specification: page 1, lines 21-24). For example, the telephone panel window displays a ten-key numeric pad or shortened dialing buttons, wherein when one of either the ten-key numeric pad or the shortened dialing buttons is designated by clicking with the pointing device, a call-dialing to the telephone line results (Appellant's specification: page 1, line 24 to page 2, line 4).

With the conventional information terminal for call dialing, telephone calls are practiced only through the dedicated telephone panel window. If a user wants to dial a telephone number which is displayed in some other general window (*e.g.*, a work window of a word processing program), the user would need to call up the dedicated telephone panel window and then enter a telephone number identical to that displayed in the general work window, for example, by operating the ten-key numeric keys displayed in the telephone panel window (Appellant's specification: page 2, lines 5-10). Thus, the manipulation of telephone numbers displayed in windows associated with general programs, such as word processors, spreadsheets, databases,

etc. (as opposed to dedicated call dialing programs), is inconvenient for the user (Appellant's specification: page 2, lines 11).

Accordingly, illustrative embodiments of Appellant's invention overcome these exemplary shortcomings of the conventional information terminals.

An illustrative embodiment of the invention is directed to a telephone call dialing method, for use in an information terminal with an operating system which can display a plurality of windows, comprising the steps of selecting a string of character information in a window displayed by the operating system, and storing the selected string of character information; extracting a telephone number from the stored string of character information; and call dialing based upon the extracted telephone number, to a line (Appellant's claim 1).

For example, as illustrated in Appellant's Fig. 7, a user selects character information (*e.g.*, "TEL 03-542-1111") displayed in a window 110 by using a pointing device (Appellant's page 11, lines 13-16). The character information is then stored in a common working memory 72 (Appellant's page 11, lines 16-19).

Next, the user causes (*e.g.*, by clicking a button of the pointing device) the character information to be read out from the common working memory 72 so that a telephone number (*e.g.*, 035421111) can be extracted from the string of character information (Appellant's page 12, lines 2-15). Thereafter, a call is initiated based on the extracted telephone number (Appellant's page 13, lines 15-21).

In this manner, a user can conveniently perform call dialing based on information (of a phone number) in the windows displayed by the OS.

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192  
U.S. Application No. 09/238,502  
Attorney Docket No. Q52863

## **VI. ISSUE**

The issue on appeal is whether or not claims 1-23 are patentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,754,636 to Bayless et al. (hereinafter "Bayless") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,652 to Coad et al. (hereinafter "Coad"), under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

For at least the reasons set forth in Section VIII below, Appellant respectfully submits that claims 1-23 are patentable over Bayless in view of Coad, under § 103(a).

## **VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS**

The claims do not stand or fall together and arguments for patentability of each group of claims, identified below, are set forth in this brief.

**Group I:** claims 1-4, 10, 12, 14 and 22, each of which stand or fall together.

**Group II:** claims 5-9, 11, 13, 15-19, 21 and 23, each of which stand or fall together.

**Group III:** claim 20, which stands alone.

## **VIII. ARGUMENTS**

Appellant respectfully requests the Board to reverse the Examiner's final rejections of the appealed claims for at least the following reasons.

**Claims 1-23 are Patentable over the Examiner's Proposed Combination of Bayless in view of Coad, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).**

*A. Claims 1-4, 10, 12, 14 and 22 (Group I) are Patentable over the Examiner's Proposed Combination of Bayless in view of Coad.*

The Examiner alleges that Bayless teaches the feature of "selecting a string of character information in a window displayed by the operating system", as recited in claim 1. In particular, the Examiner alleges that Bayless teaches these features by describing that a user can import phone directories created for other applications (*citing* Bayless: col. 23, lines 56-61) by use of

drag-and-drop from a file value window 362 (of an import map window 358) to a database map window 360 (*citing* Bayless: col. 24, lines 12-14; and Fig. 31).

To the contrary, in Bayless, import map window 358 facilitates the importing of phone directories, which were previously created for other applications, by a user (Bayless: col. 24, lines 33-35). Because the values to be imported are displayed in this import map window 358, the user can view the actual data to be imported, allowing easy creation of a mapping in database map window 360 (Bayless: col. 24, lines 34-37).

By viewing the data of a record to be imported in import map window 358, the user can see what each position in the imported records represents (Bayless: col. 24, lines 15-17; and Fig. 31). For example, in Fig. 31 of Bayless, the user can look at the values displayed in import map window 358 and determine that the values for position 4 represent a name suffix. Accordingly, Bayless allows the user to drag from position 4 of the import map window 358 and to drop on name suffix directory field in database map window 360. In this manner, a user can assign a position for each imported field (of the imported records) to particular directory fields (Bayless: col. 24, lines 19-22). When the user has finished designating the mapping in the database map window 360, the user can save the mapping to a file and perform the importation using the saved mapping (Bayless: col. 24, lines 28-31).

The dragging and dropping between import map window 358 and database map window 360 in order to create a field mapping for previously created records (of phone directories) to be imported, as described in Bayless, does not correspond to “selecting a string of character information in a window displayed by the operating system”, as recited in claim 1. Instead, the

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192  
U.S. Application No. 09/238,502  
Attorney Docket No. Q52863

dragging and dropping operations relied on by the Examiner are merely used to map the position of fields of records to be imported to existing directory fields. This mapping does not involve the selection of a string of character information. Instead, once the user has defined the positions for the fields of the records to be imported (*i.e.*, has created the mapping), the importation of actual data from the records to be imported occurs without the user having to select any information. Thus, the importing (of records from) phone directories created for other applications into an existing database is fundamentally different from the step of “selecting a string of character information in a window displayed by the operating system”, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 further recites “storing the selected string of character information”, “extracting a telephone number from the stored string of character information” and “call dialing based upon the extracted telephone number, to a line”.

The aforementioned dragging and dropping operation (*i.e.*, the import map designing operation) of Bayless merely results in the creation of a mapping for imported records and does not teach or suggest any of the storing, extracting and call-dialing steps of claim 1. Instead, in Bayless, after the importing of the records according to the created mapping, a user must still take additional action(s) to initiate call dialing to a particular telephone number, for example, accessing the directory to find the telephone number to be called.

Furthermore, in Bayless, a user must use one of the dedicated windows of the calling program (*e.g.*, a “directories” window or a “make and answer calls” window as illustrated in Figs. 14 and 34 of Bayless, respectively) in order to execute call dialing. Thus, Bayless suffers

from problems similar to those identified in Appellant's specification relating to conventional operating systems and/or information terminals (*see* Appellant's specification: page 2, lines 5-11). For example, if a user wants to initiate a call based on text containing a phone number, which is displayed in some general window, the user must then use one of the dedicated windows to find the information corresponding to the phone number (*e.g.*, in an existing phone directory), create a new record corresponding to the phone number or manually input the phone number, before call dialing can commence.

Consequently, Bayless fails to disclose or suggest that a telephone number is conveniently extracted from a string of character information, which was selected from information displayed in a general window by the OS, and call dialing using the extracted telephone number.

Additionally, Coad is only relied on by the Examiner for describing a text parser 124 that separates a call-back telephone number, using predetermined delimiters, that was embedded in a text message (*see* Office Action dated November 18, 2003: pages 3-4). Coad fails to make up for the exemplary deficiencies of Bayless set forth above.

For example, like Bayless, Coad fails to teach or suggest "selecting a string of character information in a window displayed by the operating system, and storing the selected string of character information", as recited in claim 1. To the contrary, Coad describes embedding a text data portion into a text message to be transmitted from one cellular phone to another, wherein the text data portion corresponds to a call-back telephone number (Coad: col. 2, lines 44-57). Thereafter, upon receipt of the text message, a text parser automatically processes the received



text message character by character to detect predetermined delimiters (Coad: col. 7, lines 32-37). Then, the text parser separates a call-back telephone number using the predetermined delimiters and stores the extracted call-back telephone number in memory (*Id.*).

Thus, in Coad, a call-back telephone number is manually entered during entry of a text message to be sent to a second cellular phone (Coad: Fig. 3, steps 202, 204 and 208). Additionally, upon receipt of the text message, a text parser of the second cellular phone automatically processes the text message and extracts the embedded call-back telephone number using the predetermined delimiters (Coad: Fig. 6A, steps 258, 260, 266, 270 and 272). The manual entry of the call-back telephone number at a transmitting end and the automatic extraction of the call-back telephone number at a receiving end does not correspond to "selecting a string of character information in a window displayed by the operating system", as recited in claim 1. Consequently, Coad fails to teach and cannot possibly suggest "extracting a telephone number from the stored string of [selected] character information", as recited in claim 1.

Further still, Appellant submits that the Examiner fails to satisfy his burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness by demonstrating some reasonable suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings, absent impermissible hindsight.

On page 4 of the Office Action (of November 18, 2003), the Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant's invention to incorporate steps and means to extract a telephone number from the stored string of character

information as taught by Coad with Bayless “in order to advantageously permit the transmission of one or more embedded call-back telephone numbers that are embedded into a text message as suggested by Coad” (*citing* Coad: col. 3, lines 21-23).

Appellant respectfully disagrees. Unlike Coad, Bayless does not relate to sending/receiving text messages, *e.g.*, using SMS, between stations. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant's invention to complicate Bayless to include unnecessary equipment to support the transmission of text messages from a sender to a receiver, the embedding of call-back numbers in the text messages, the reception of text messages at a receiver from a sender and the automatic extraction of call-back numbers embedded in the received text messages, as described in Coad. Indeed, neither Bayless nor Coad (alone or in combination) suggest such a radical modification of Bayless.

Furthermore, Appellant reminds the Examiner that any motivation to modify or combine references (with a reasonable expectation of success) must come from the references themselves or the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, and not from Appellant's disclosure (*see* MPEP § 2143; *see also In re Sang Su Lee*, 61 USPQ2d 1433 (Fed. Cir. 2002)). Consequently, the Examiner has provided no reasonable suggestion or motivation, absent impermissible hindsight, to combine the teachings of Bayless and Coad in the manner proposed.

In view of the above, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the Examiner's proposed combination of Bayless and Coad, under § 103(a). Claims 10 and 22 recite features similar to claim 1 and thus are patentable over Bayless and Coad, under § 103(a), based on a rationale

analogous to that set forth above for claim 1. Consequently, claims 2-4, 12 and 14 are patentable over Bayless and Coad, under § 103(a), at least by virtue of their dependency.

*B. Claims 5-9, 11, 13, 15-19, 21 and 23 (Group II) are Patentable over the Examiner's Proposed Combination of Bayless in view of Coad.*

Claim 5, which is directed to a call dialing method, for use in an information terminal with an operating system which can display a plurality of windows, recites features similar to claim 1 and thus is patentable over Bayless and Coad, under § 103(a), based on a rationale analogous to that set forth above for claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, “displaying a first window”, “selecting a string of character information in a second window displayed by the operating system, and storing the selected string of character information”, “extracting a telephone number from the stored string of character information” and “displaying the extracted telephone number in the first window”.

In claim 5, a first window and a second window are displayed. A string of character information, displayed in the second window, is selected and then stored. After extracting a telephone number from the stored string of character information, the extracted telephone number is displayed in the first window.

The Examiner alleges that Bayless teaches the first and second windows of claim 5 as an extended phone number information window 288 and a phone number folder 282, respectively (Office Action dated November 18, 2003: page 4; *see* Bayless: Figs. 21 and 22).

To the contrary, in Bayless, the phone number folder 282 lists a plurality of phone numbers associated with a particular directory entry, as displayed within directory entry window

280 (Bayless: col. 21, lines 12-22). Furthermore, a user may assign or unassign a dial plan to a particular phone number using the extended phone number information window 288, wherein the extended phone number information window 288 corresponds to a phone number folder 282 (Bayless: col. 21, lines 35-50). As illustrated in Fig. 21 of Bayless, a dial plan icon 284 only appears next those phone numbers having a dialing plan associated therewith (Bayless: col. 21, lines 26-33).

The extended phone number information window 288 and the phone number folder 282 of Bayless do not correspond, respectively, to the first window and the second window recited in claim 5 because, for example, a string of character information, displayed in the phone number folder 282, is not selected and stored such that a telephone number is extracted from the stored string of character information, wherein the extracted telephone number is then displayed in the extended phone number information window 288.

Instead, Bayless merely illustrates that phone number information that was previously entered and stored for a user can be displayed in more than one window related to a telephone directory. In Bayless, a directory entry window 280 displays a directory entry for one particular person (*e.g.*, Bob Atkins), wherein the directory entry includes a phone number folder 282 for listing a plurality of phone numbers associated with the particular directory entry, in this case, associated with Bob Atkins, such as his office number, fax number, page number, etc. (Bayless: col. 21, lines 12-22).

By clicking on an extended phone number information icon 286 next to any of the phone numbers listed in the phone number folder 282 for Bob Atkins, an extended phone number

information window 288 is displayed, wherein a user may assign or unassign a dial plan (*i.e.*, customize the way a call to a telephone number is placed) to the particular phone number of Bob Atkins. Clicking on the extended phone number information icon 286 does not teach or suggest “selecting a string of character information in a second window displayed by the operating system, and storing the selected string of character information”, as recited in claim 5.

To the contrary, clicking on the icon 286 merely causes a related window to be displayed, wherein some information (*e.g.*, the phone number 214-555-9452) can be displayed in both the directory entry window 280 (via the phone number folder 282) and the extended phone number information window 288. No information is selected or stored by clicking on the icon 286. Consequently, no telephone number is extracted (or can be extracted) from clicking on the icon 286.

Furthermore, Bayless fails to teach or suggest that “after extracting a telephone number from the stored string of character information, the extracted telephone number is displayed in the first window” (*i.e.*, the extended phone number information window 288). As noted above, the phone number displayed in the extended phone number information window 288 (*i.e.*, 214-555-9452) corresponds to a phone number previously entered in a phone directory, and similarly displayed in corresponding directory entry window 280 (via the phone number folder 282) and not to a phone number extracted from a selected and stored string of character information.

Since Coad fails to make up for these deficiencies of Bayless (*see* Section VIII(A)), claim 5 is not rendered obvious by the Examiner's proposed combination of Bayless and Coad, under § 103(a). Additionally, Appellant submits that the Examiner fails to satisfy his burden of

establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness by demonstrating some reasonable suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings, absent impermissible hindsight. Instead, in rejecting claim 5, the Examiner simply repeats the same purported motivation described above with respect to claim 1 (*c.f.*, Office Action dated November 18, 2003: pages 4 and 6). Therefore, the Examiner fails to satisfy his burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least the reasons set forth above in Section VIII(A).

Claims 11 and 23 recite features similar to claim 5 and thus are patentable over Bayless and Coad, under § 103(a), based on a rationale analogous to that set forth above for claim 5. Consequently, claims 6-9, 13, 15-19 and 21 are patentable over Bayless and Coad, under § 103(a), at least by virtue of their dependency.

*C. Claim 20 (Group III) is Patentable over the Examiner's Proposed Combination of Bayless in view of Coad.*

Claim 20 depends from claim 11, which is patentable over Bayless and Coad, under § 103(a), for at least the reasons set forth above in Section VIII(B). Thus, claim 20 is patentable over Bayless and Coad, under § 103(a), at least by virtue of its dependency.

Furthermore, claim 20 recites that “when the display application means sets the first window to a tool bar display form, the extraction means does not extract the telephone number from the character information”.

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192  
U.S. Application No. 09/238,502  
Attorney Docket No. Q52863

The Examiner alleges that Bayless teaches these features (*see* Office Action dated November 18, 2003: page 6). In particular, the Examiner alleges that Bayless teaches that when the display application means sets the first window to a tool bar display form (*citing* Bayless: col. 21, lines 40-50), the extraction means does not extract the telephone number from the character information (*citing* Bayless: col. 19, lines 38-45), as recited in claim 5.

To the contrary, Bayless does not teach or suggest that “the display application means sets the first window to a tool bar display form”, as recited in claim 20. The extended phone number information window 288 referenced by the Examiner is displayed as a window (described more fully above in Section VIII(B)) and not in a tool bar display form. Consequently, Bayless fails to teach or suggest that an extraction means does not extract the telephone number from the character information when the tool bar display form is used.

Since Coad fails to make up for these deficiencies of Bayless, claim 20 is not rendered obvious by the Examiner's proposed combination of Bayless and Coad, under § 103(a). Additionally, Appellant submits that the Examiner fails to satisfy his burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness by demonstrating some reasonable suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings, absent impermissible hindsight, in rejecting claim 20.

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192  
U.S. Application No. 09/238,502  
Attorney Docket No. Q52863

### **IX. CONCLUSION**

Appellant respectfully requests the members of the Board to reverse the rejections of the appealed claims and to find each of the claims allowable as defining subject matter that is patentable over the art of record.

The present Brief on Appeal is being filed in triplicate. Unless a check is submitted herewith for the fee required under 37 C.F.R. §1.192(a) and 1.17(c), please charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Billy Carter Raulerson  
Registration No. 52,156

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 10, 2004





## APPENDIX

### CLAIMS 1-23 ON APPEAL:

1. A telephone call dialing method, for use in an information terminal with an operating system which can display a plurality of windows, comprising the steps of:  
  
    selecting a string of character information in a window displayed by the operating system, and storing the selected string of character information;  
  
    extracting a telephone number from the stored string of character information; and  
  
    call dialing based upon the extracted telephone number, to a line.
2. The telephone call dialing method according to claim 1, wherein the selected piece of character information is stored in a common working memory which is shared by the operating system.
3. The telephone call dialing method according to claim 1, wherein the selected string of character information is one selected by a regional designation, and then stored in a common working memory which is shared by the operating system.
4. The telephone call dialing method according to claim 1, wherein the step of extracting a telephone number includes deleting information except for that relevant to numerals from the selected string of character information, and the telephone number is extracted from the resulting remainder.

5. A telephone call dialing method, for use in an information terminal with an operating system which can display a plurality of windows, comprising the steps of:
- displaying a first window;
  - selecting a string of character information in a second window displayed by the operating system, and storing the selected string of character information;
  - extracting a telephone number from the stored string of character information;
  - displaying the extracted telephone number in the first window; and
  - call dialing based upon the extracted telephone number, to a line.
6. The telephone call dialing method according to claim 5, wherein the first window is displayed overlapped on top of the plurality of windows displayed on the screen.
7. The telephone call dialing method according to claim 5, wherein the first window is displayed as a tool bar.
8. The telephone call dialing method according to claim 5, wherein the first window comprises a telephone region with call dialing keys used to designate a telephone call dialing destination, and the telephone call dialing method further comprises the steps of:
- selecting that one of the call dialing keys in the telephone region,
  - detecting the selected telephone number, and
  - call-dialing based upon the detected telephone number.

9. The telephone call dialing method according to claim 5, wherein the first window further comprises a call log region where the past telephone call dialing destinations are displayed, and the telephone call dialing method further comprises the steps of:

selecting one of the past telephone call dialing destinations displayed in the call log region,

detecting the selected telephone number, and

call-dialing based upon the detected telephone number.

10. An information terminal, with an operating system which can display a plurality of windows, comprising:

storage means for storing a string of character information selected through a window displayed by the operating system;

extraction means for extracting a telephone number from the string of character information stored in the storage means; and

output means for outputting the extracted telephone number in order to call-dial to a line.

11. An information terminal, with an operating system which can display a plurality of windows, comprising:

display application means for executing an application used to display a first window for assistance in controlling a call dialing operation;

selection means for selecting a string of character information in a second window displayed by the operating system;

storage means for storing the selected string of character information;

extraction means for extracting a telephone number from the stored string of character information; and

output means for outputting the extracted telephone number in order to call-dial to a line.

12. The information terminal according to claim 10, further comprising call dialing control means for controlling the operation of call dialing based upon the telephone number output from the output means, to the line.

13. The information terminal according to claim 11, wherein the display application means controls said display to display the extracted telephone number in the first window.

14. The information terminal according to claim 10, wherein the extraction means deletes information except for the one relevant to numerals from the selected string of character information, and extracts a telephone number from the resulting remainder.

15. The information terminal according to claim 11, wherein the display application means controls said display to display the first window which is overlapped on the top of the plurality of windows displayed in the display.

16. The information terminal according to claim 11, wherein the output means adds a given number to the top of the extracted telephone number, and outputs the extracted telephone number with the given number.

17. The information terminal according to claim 11, wherein the display application means attaches a given character string to the extracted telephone number, and controls said display to display the extracted telephone number with the given number.

18. The information terminal according to claim 11, wherein the display application means controls the first window to an inactive state responsive to an inactive signal.

19. The information terminal according to claim 18, wherein the extraction means does not extract the telephone number from the character information responsive to said inactive signal.

20. The information terminal according to claim 11, wherein when the display application means sets the first window to a tool bar display form, the extraction means does not extract the telephone number from the character information.

21. The information terminal according to claim 11, wherein said first window is displayed as a tool bar.

22. A recording medium, which stores a program to be executed by a computer, wherein the program includes:

a procedure for selecting a string of character information in a window displayed by the operating system, and storing the selected string of character information;

a procedure for extracting a telephone number from the stored string of character information; and

a procedure for call dialing based upon the extracted telephone number, to a line.

23. A recording medium, which stores a program to be executed by a computer, wherein the program includes:

a procedure for displaying a first window which assists a telephone call dialing operation;

a procedure for selecting a string of character information in a second window, which is different from the first window, and storing the selected string of character information;

a procedure for extracting a telephone number from the stored character information; and

a procedure of call dialing the extracted telephone number to call-dial to a line, in response to the telephone call dialing operation at the first window.



**PATENT APPLICATION**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re application of

Docket No. Q52863

Yoshikazu KOBAYASHI

Appln. No. 09/238,502

Group Art Unit: 2644

Confirmation No. 6211

Examiner: TRAN, C.

Filed: January 27, 1999

For: INFORMATION TERMINAL CAPABLE OF ORIGINATING A CALL, METHOD OF  
ORIGINATING A CALL AND RECORDING MEDIUM WHICH STORES THE  
PROGRAM FOR ORIGINATING A CALL

**SUBMISSION OF APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL**

**MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Submitted herewith please find an original and two copies of Appellant's Brief on Appeal. A check for the statutory fee of \$330.00 is attached. The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account. A duplicate copy of this paper is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Billy Carter Raulerson  
Registration No. 52,156

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 10, 2004